

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION**

CEASE AND DESIST ORDER NO. R2-2008-0006

**REQUIRING THE CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 5
TO CEASE AND DESIST DISCHARGING WASTEWATER
IN VIOLATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO WATERS OF THE STATE**

WHEREAS the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (hereinafter “Regional Water Board”), finds that:

1. The Contra Costa County Sanitation District No. 5 (hereinafter “Discharger”) owns and operates a wastewater treatment plant, located at the end of Canyon Lake Drive, Port Costa, Contra Costa County. The plant treats domestic wastewater from the community of Port Costa. It has a dry weather design capacity of 0.033 million gallons per day.
2. The wastewater discharge has been regulated by waste discharge requirements in Order No. R-2-2003-0009 (NPDES Permit No. CA0037885).
3. Concurrent with the adoption of this Cease and Desist Order, the Regional Water Board adopted Order No. R2-2008-0005 (hereinafter “Permit”), reissuing waste discharge requirements for the Discharger. The Permit contains prohibitions, limitations, and provisions regulating the discharge. The limitations include those listed in Table 1 below, among others.

Table 1: Permit Effluent Limits

Parameter	Final Effluent Limits in Permit		Monitoring Station
	Average Monthly Effluent Limit (µg/L)	Maximum Daily Effluent Limit (µg/L)	
Mercury	0.020	0.041	E-001

4. The Discharger submitted an infeasibility study demonstrating that it cannot comply with the effluent limits listed in Table 1. As stated in the Permit findings, the Regional Water Board concurs with the Discharger because the maximum effluent concentration exceeds the average monthly and daily maximum limits, 0.20 µg/L and 0.041 µg/L, respectively.
5. Water Code § 13301 authorizes the Regional Water Board to issue a Cease and Desist Order when it finds that a waste discharge is taking place, or threatening to take place, in violation of Regional Water Board requirements.

6. Because the Discharger will violate or threatens to violate required effluent limits, this Order is necessary to ensure that the Discharger achieves compliance. This Order establishes time schedules for the Discharger to complete necessary investigative, preventive, and remedial actions to address its imminent and threatened violations.
7. The time schedules in this Order are parameter-specific and intended to be as short as possible. They account for the considerable uncertainty in determining effective measures (e.g., pollution prevention and treatment plant upgrades) necessary to achieve compliance. This Order allows some time to first explore source control measures before requiring further actions, such as treatment plant upgrades, which are likely to be much more costly. The time schedules are based on reasonably expected times needed to implement source identification and upstream source control, evaluate success, identify on-site treatment alternatives if necessary, test and select from among alternatives, and construct plant upgrades. The Regional Water Board may revisit these assumptions as more information becomes available.
8. As part of the time schedules to achieve compliance, this Order requires the Discharger to comply with interim effluent limits, where feasible. These interim limits are intended to ensure that the Discharger maintains at least its existing performance while completing all tasks required during the time schedules. The interim limits are based on past performance or limits in previous orders, whichever are more stringent. If based on past performance, the interim limits represent the 99.87th percentile of actual measured discharge concentrations (three standard deviations from the mean).

There is insufficient mercury effluent data to calculate a mean or standard deviation, and the maximum observed effluent concentration for the WWTP for the period from June 2002-March 2007 is 0.044 µg/L. The Discharger requested an interim mercury limit of 0.087 µg/L, which is based on secondary treatment performance of POTWs in the San Francisco Bay region as cited in the June 2001, Water Board Staff Report entitled *Statistical Analysis of Pooled Data From Regionwide Ultraclean Mercury Sampling for Municipal Dischargers*. The Regional Water Board grants this request, and this Order establishes the interim mercury effluent limitation at 0.087 µg/L.

9. This Order is an enforcement action and, as such, is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) in accordance with 14 CCR § 15321.
10. The Regional Water Board notified the Discharger and interested persons of its intent to consider adoption of this Cease and Desist Order, and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and appear at a public hearing. The Regional Water Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, in accordance with Water Code § 13301, that the Discharger shall cease and desist from discharging and threatening to discharge wastes in violation of its Permit by complying with the following provisions:

1. Prescribed Actions. The Discharger shall comply with the required actions in Table 2 in accordance with the time schedules provided therein to comply with all effluent limits contained in the Permit. All deliverables listed in Table 2 shall be acceptable to the Executive Officer, who will review them for adequacy and compliance with the Table 2 requirements. The Discharger shall further implement all actions set forth in each deliverable, unless the Executive Officer finds the deliverable to be unacceptable.
2. Exceptions. The following exceptions apply to the parameter-specific time schedules and prescribed actions in Table 2.
 - a. *Mercury*. The mercury-related time schedules and prescribed actions shall cease to be in effect upon the effective date of a permit* that supersedes the mercury limits in the Permit.
3. Reporting Delays. If the Discharger is delayed, interrupted, or prevented from meeting one or more of the time schedules in Table 2 due to circumstances beyond its reasonable control, the Discharger shall promptly notify the Executive Officer, provide the reasons and justification for the delay, and propose time schedules for resolving the delay.
4. Consequences of Non-Compliance. If the Discharger fails to comply with the provisions of this Order, the Executive Officer is authorized to take further enforcement action or to request the Attorney General to take appropriate actions against the Discharger in accordance with Water Code §§ 13331, 13350, 13385, and 13386. Such actions may include injunctive and civil remedies, if appropriate, or the issuance of an Administrative Civil Liability Complaint for Regional Water Board consideration.
5. Effective Date. This Order shall be effective on the effective date of the Permit.

* In November 2007, the Regional Water Board adopted a permit that will supersede existing mercury requirements and implement the wasteload allocations for municipal and industrial wastewater discharges identified in the San Francisco Bay Mercury TMDL that the Regional Water Board adopted in August 2006.

Table 2: Time Schedules and Prescribed Actions

Action	Deadline
	Mercury
a. Comply with the following interim effluent limits at Monitoring Station EFF-001: <i>Mercury</i> : Maximum daily effluent limit = 0.087 µg/L	Upon the effective date of this Order
b. If discharge data from the previous two years continue to show that the discharge is out of compliance (as defined in Section 2.4.5 of the State Implementation Policy) with the permit effluent limits, submit a plan for identifying all mercury sources to the discharge. Examples of potential mercury sources include dental offices, laboratories, medical facilities, fluorescent light tubes, thermometers, and electrical switches. The plan shall, at a minimum, include sampling influent waste streams to identify and quantify pollutant sources.	January 1, 2009
c. Implement the plan developed in action “b” within 30 days following the deadline for action “b,” and submit by the deadline for this action a report that contains an inventory of the pollutant sources.	June 1, 2009
d. Submit a report documenting development and initial implementation of a program to reduce and prevent the pollutants of concern in the discharge. The program shall consist, at a minimum, of the following elements: i. Maintain a list of sources of pollutants of concern. ii. Investigate each source to assess the need to include it in the program. iii. Identify and implement targeted actions to reduce or eliminate discharges from each source in the program. iv. Develop and distribute, as appropriate, educational materials regarding the need to prevent sources to the sewer system.	January 1, 2010
e. Continue to implement the program described in action “d” and submit annual status reports that evaluate its effectiveness and summarize planned changes. Report whether the program has successfully brought the discharge into compliance with the effluent limits in the Permit. If not, identify and implement additional measures to further reduce discharges.	Annually each February 28 in Best Management Practices and Pollutant Minimization Report required by Permit Provision VI.C.3

Action	Deadline
	Mercury
<p>f. If by February 28, 2011, discharge data continue to show the discharge is out of compliance (as defined in 2.4.5 of the State Implementation Policy) with the Permit effluent limits, submit a report, by the deadline for this action, identifying more aggressive actions to ensure compliance. These actions shall include, but not be limited to, reviewing options for pretreatment and upgrades to the treatment plant. The report shall identify an implementation schedule for investigating these options, selecting a preferred option, and implementing the chosen option. At a minimum, the report shall plan for the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Bench scale testing or pilot scale testing or both ii. Development of preliminary design specifications iii. Development of final design specifications iv. Procurement of funding v. Acquisition of necessary permits and approvals vi. Construction 	January 1, 2012
<p>g. Implement the plan required in action “f” within 45 days following the deadline for action “f,” and submit annual status reports.</p>	Annually each January 30 in the Annual Self-Monitoring Report required by Permit Attachment E, Monitoring and Reporting Program
<p>h. Submit documentation confirming complete plan implementation and comply with effluent limits in the Permit.</p>	June 1, 2015

I, Bruce H. Wolfe, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, on January 30, 2008.

BRUCE H. WOLFE
Executive Officer